

Col. Armstrong/ts
21 October 1962

THE U. S. CASE

In developing the guidance on the line to be followed by State and USIA in conveying to foreign governments and their populations the justification for US action, the following main points should be included:

1. The Soviets stated publicly and privately that only defensive weapons were being sent to Cuba. This is now proven as false as many other Soviet promises. In fact, the Soviets have with great secrecy introduced nuclear weapons into an area previously free from them. This clandestine nuclear diffusion contrasts sharply and revealingly with their propaganda line and positions in arms control and test ban talks.

2. The Soviets are artificially seeking to create for their own aggressive purposes a connection which ~~does not~~ ^{would not otherwise} exist between Berlin and Cuba. Their presence in Cuba is against the will of the people; allied presence in Berlin is overwhelmingly at the wish of the inhabitants. The allies have scrupulously avoided introducing offensive forces, let alone nuclear weapons, into Berlin; the Soviets have created in Cuba a nuclear base aimed at intimidating Western Hemisphere nations.

3. The great difference between the Soviet base in Cuba and allied bases elsewhere lies in the peaceful purposes of the Free World and the aggressive purposes of the Communist Bloc. US and allied bases exist purely for the purpose of sustaining and securing the freedom of people in those areas and of the Free World generally. A look at the history

DECLASSIFIED

E. O. 11652, SEC. 3(E), 5(D), 5(E) AND 11

OSD Ltr. (OLK-77-1056)
BY MPM NARS DATE 3/13/78


2

[REDACTED]

of the last 20 years and at the map shows what Soviet purposes have been: to use whatever means, including force, may advance their end of acquiring control over territory and peoples, stripping them of their freedom in the process. The Cuban people want the Russian military presence removed; the Koreans, the Turks, and the others want US forces to remain. These people know that a US presence guarantees their freedom, and the world has seen how a Soviet military presence destroys freedom.

4. This reckless Soviet act has endangered the peace of the world. The juxtaposition of certain sorts of military force and certain geographical areas creates problems of acute sensitivity, and there has been previously a tacit understanding among nations that these peculiarly sensitive deployments should be avoided. Thus the US has refrained from many positionings of military power of which it was capable because it recognized valid national security interests of the USSR and others. This Soviet action brazenly disregards the valid national security interests of the American Republics, including the United States, and has moved international tensions onto a new high plateau. We cannot be sure whether the madman Castro has been given, or may seek forcibly to get, control over these weapons.

5. The US action is just and self-restrained. The President had given fair, timely warning that the security interests of our people and those of other American nations to whose common defense we are pledged could not tolerate the insertion of such weapons into the Hemisphere. Now that the Soviet Union and the Cuban regime so recklessly



have disregarded this warning about Hemisphere security interests, the US would be fully justified in taking substantially stronger actions. We seek only to preserve our security interests and those of our allies at the lowest level of military effort we estimate will reasonably do so. The US has always had military capabilities vis-a-vis Cuba far beyond those which we have exercised; today that fact is even more true than before. It is the essence of the distinction between the Soviet Union and the United States that they use any military advantage they possess in order to enslave people, while we, wanting self-determination for all peoples, abstain from the use of force except where the freedom of our people and our allies is in peril.